United States District Court Southern District of Texas

Page 1 of 2

ENTERED

April 24, 2023 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

ATAIN SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:21-CV-02122

TRIPLE PG SAND DEVELOPMENT,
LLC,

Defendant.

S

Defendant.

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Atain Specialty Insurance Company's Motion for Certificate of Appealability (Doc. #38) and United States Magistrate Judge Yvonne Y. Ho's Memorandum and Recommendation filed on April 4, 2023 (Doc. #39). The deadline for filing objections has passed, and no objections have been filed. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the Memorandum and Recommendation for clear error. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989). Finding no clear error, the Court adopts the Memorandum and Recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff seeks certification from the Court to appeal the Court's denial of its Motion for Summary Judgment (the "Order," Doc. #37) under 28 U.S.C. §1292(b). Doc. #38. "Section 1292(b) appeals are exceptional." *Clark-Dietz & Assocs. v. Basic Constr. Co.*, 702 F.2d 67, 69 (5th Cir. 1983). The Order applied "clearly established . . . controlling Texas law that an insurer owes its insured a duty to defend 'if a plaintiff's factual allegations potentially support a covered claim." *Endurance Am. Specialty Ins. Co. v. Brown, Miclette & Britt, Inc.*, 2010 WL 816710, at

*2 (S.D. Tex. Mar. 4, 2010) (quoting *Zurich Am. Ins. Co. v. Nokia, Inc.*, 268 S.W.3d 487, 490 (Tex. 2008)). Plaintiff's mere disagreement with the Court's Order fails to demonstrate a "substantial ground for difference of opinion." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Certificate of Appealability (Doc. #38) is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED.

APR 2 4 2023

Date

The Honorable Alfred H. Bennett United States District Judge